

Dear Sirs (I have noticed that you are all men):

I have been perplexed and confounded these past few years by big conglomerate networks using the public airwaves for anything but the public good.

Another brazen example of this is the latest Sinclair Broadcasting network attempt to force their stations to broadcast an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election. This is clearly not news, any more than Fahrenheit 9/11 or Going Upriver, is news. Among other things, isn't this against election laws? If not, I understand Michael Moore has offered Fahrenheit 9/11 free to Sinclair to balance the anti-Kerry movie. Surely they would be happy to show Moore's movie to put to rest any doubts about their intentions! If they refuse, I believe it is a clear example of their bias and the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. Now, I concede that they probably think this is for the public good, but should the people taking the action be the final arbiters of a questionable if not illegal action? Isn't that what you are there for?

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard, and if they proceed with this action, I believe their license should be suspended.

Thank you.